



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,864	03/30/2001	Thomas B. Brightman	MOTOR001.001	5622

25247 7590 06/28/2004

GORDON E NELSON
PATENT ATTORNEY, PC
57 CENTRAL ST
PO BOX 782
ROWLEY, MA 01969

EXAMINER

EL HADY, NABIL M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/674,864

Applicant(s)

BRIGHTMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Nabil M El-Hady

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2001 and 30 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 14-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2154

1. Claims 1-13 are cancelled in accordance with preliminary amendment filed 3/30/2001, wherein claims 1-10 are added.
2. The numbering of claims 1-10 is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 1-10 have been renumbered 14-23.
3. Claims 14-23 are now pending in this application.
4. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.
5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
6. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hansen et al. (US 5,794,060).

Art Unit: 2154

7. As to claim 14, Hansen discloses the invention as claimed including an integrated circuit (Fig. 19; col. 26, lines 52-5; and col. 27, lines 16-25) comprising: a plurality of data stream inputs and/or outputs that receive and/or transmit streams of data (14, 16, 18, 28, Fig. 1; 132, 136, 140, 144, 146, Fig. 7; and 216, Fig. 19); a plurality of data stream processors that process the streams of data, each data stream processor being coupled to a data stream input and/or data stream output (12, Fig. 18(a)-(c); 12, Fig. 7; PROCESSOR12, and I/O 216, Fig. 19; and col. 25, lines 54-56) and including a writeable instruction memory containing instructions (INSTR^N BUFFER CACHE 118, Fig. 7; 32 KBYTE I-CACHE118, Fig. 19; col. 16, lines 54-59; and col. 27, lines 54-60) and a control data processor that controls the data stream processor by sequentially executing instructions from the writeable instruction memory (ETLB & TAGS 122, and Fig. 7; MMU 122, Fig. 19.)

8. As to claim 15, Hansen discloses the control data processor is a general-purpose microprocessor that has an industry standard architecture, whereby programs for the control data processor may be developed using standard tools for the architecture (col. 16, lines 1-14).

9. As to claim 16, Hansen discloses the streams of data include a serial streams and a parallel stream (col. 17, lines 18-21).

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2154

11. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (US 5,794,060), hereafter "Hansen" in view of Kolchinsky (US 5,535,406).

12. As to claim 17, Hansen does not disclose an aggregator for aggregating certain of the data stream processors to cooperate in processing a stream of data. Kolchinsky, on the other hand, discloses aggregating certain of the data stream processors to cooperate in processing a stream of data (col. 6, lines 63 to col. 7, line 8; and col. 8, lines 19-32) including configurable interconnections between the aggregated data stream processors (Figs. 3-5); a configurable operation coordinator that coordinates operation of the aggregated data stream processors (configuration controller 32, and Virtual Processor Module Controller 30; Fig. 7) and a writeable configuration that specifies the configurable interconnections and the configurable operation coordinator as required to aggregate the data stream processors (configuration memory 33, Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hansen and Kolchinsky because Kolchinsky's use of aggregator for aggregating certain of the data stream processors to cooperate in processing a stream of data would enhance the functionality of Hansen system by allowing a configurable logic to offer a new mixture of performance and versatility (see, Kolchinsky, col. 1, lines 50-60).

13. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (US 5,794,060), hereafter "Hansen" in view of Murata et al. (US 6,216,179), hereafter "Murata".

14. As to claim 18, Hansen discloses the integrated circuit may be used with a plurality of transmission protocols (Figs. 1 and 2). However, Hansen does not disclose a writeable configuration specifier for specifying a configuration of the data stream inputs and/or outputs.

Art Unit: 2154

Murata, on the other hand, discloses a writeable configuration specifier for specifying a configuration of the data stream inputs and/or outputs (col. 10, lines 19-34). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hansen and Murata because Murata's use of configuration specifier for specifying a configuration of the data stream inputs and/or outputs would enhance the functionality of Hansen system by allowing a configurable logic to offer a new mixture of performance and versatility.

15. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (US 5,794,060), hereafter "Hansen" in view of Deb et al. (US 6,172,990), hereafter "Deb".

16. As to claim 19, Hansen does not disclose the data stream processor further comprising a receive processor and/or a transmit processor. Deb, on the other hand, discloses the data stream processor further comprising a receive processor that operates under control of the control data processor to process the data stream received from the data stream input and/or a transmit processor that operates under control of the control data processor to process the data stream for output to the data stream output (Fig. 8; and col. 21, lines 30-67). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hansen and Deb because Deb's use of receive and/or transmit processor would enhance the functionality of Hansen system by providing dedicated processing for the different requirements of the receive and transmit processing.

17. As to claim 20, Hansen discloses each of the processor (working as receive or transmit processor) comprises a writeable instruction memory containing instructions (INSTR^N BUFFER CACHE 118, Fig. 7; 32 KBYTE I-CACHE 118, Fig. 19; col. 16, lines 54-59; and col. 27, lines

Art Unit: 2154

54-60); and the processor sequentially executes certain of the instructions to process the data stream (col. 16, lines 1-14, 54-66).

18. As to claim 21, Hansen discloses the processor (receive and/or transmit) have a plurality of processing components and are configurable to bypass one or more of the components in processing the data streams (col. 11, lines 24-32; and Figs. 5 and 6).

19. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (US 5,794,060) and/or Hansen et al. (US 5,794,060) in view of Deb et al. (US 6,172,990), and/or Hansen et al. (US 5,794,060) in view of Kolchinsky (US 5,535,406), and/or Hansen et al. (US 5,794,060) in view of Murata et al. (US 6,216,179), and further in view of Yajima (US 5,809,176) in accordance with the multiple dependency of the claim.

20. As to claim 22, Hansen, Deb, Kolchinsky, and Murata do not disclose a context processor to produce information about given data stream's context. Yajima, on the other hand, discloses a context processor that responds to information received from a given data stream processor that is processing a data stream to produce information about the given data stream's context and provide the context information to the given data stream processor, the given data stream processor using the context information to process the data stream (col. 5, lines 41-48). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hansen, Hanson and Deb, Hanson and Kolchinsky, or Hanson and Murata; and Yajima because Yajima's use of a context processor would enhance the functionality of the produced system by speeding up the processing of the data stream in the data stream processor as a result of providing information about stream context.

Art Unit: 2154

21. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (US 5,794,060) in view of Deb et al. (US 6,172,990); or Hansen et al. (US 5,794,060) in view of Kolchinsky (US 5,535,406) and further in view of Deb et al. (US 6,172,990), or Hansen et al. (US 5,794,060) in view of Murata et al. (US 6,216,179) and further in view of Deb et al. (US 6,172,990) in accordance with the multiple dependency of the claim.

22. As to claim 23, Hansen, Kolchinsky, and Murata do not disclose the detailed components of the integrated system for data stream transmission. Deb, however, discloses a stream of data contains control data and payload (col. 19, lines 59-67); a received stream of data is processed in a receiving data stream processor to extract the control data and the payload (RECV Stream Proc 114b, Fig. 8) and a transmitted stream of data is processed in a transmitting data stream processor to add control data to the payload (XMIT Stream Proc 114a, and Encapsulated Packet, Fig. 8); a buffer manager coupled to the data stream processors that provides addresses of buffers for storing payload and responds to a write operation with a buffer address to write payload to the addressed buffer and to a read operation with a buffer address to read payload to from the addressed buffer (FIFO CONTROLLER 110, 112, Fig. 2A); and a queue manager coupled to the data stream processors that manages queues of descriptors of payload, each descriptor including at least a buffer address, the queue manager responding to an enqueue command by enqueueing a descriptor provided with the command to a queue specified in the command and responding to a dequeue command by dequeuing a descriptor from the queue specified in the command (Queue FIFO 106, 108, Fig. 2A), a data stream processor responding to a received stream of data by performing a write operation to the buffer manager with the received data stream's payload and an address provided by the buffer

Art Unit: 2154

manager and performing an enqueue operation with a descriptor containing the address and transmitting a stream of data by performing a dequeue operation, using the address in a descriptor obtained as a result of the dequeue operation in a read operation to the buffer manager, producing a data stream using the payload received from the buffer manager, and transmitting the produced data stream (STREAM PROCESSOR, 1141, 114b, Fig. 2A). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hansen, Hanson, Hanson and Kolchinsky, or Hanson and Murata; and Deb because Deb's use of a buffer manager, a queue manager with the data stream processor would enhance the functionality of the produced system by speeding up the processing of the data stream in the data stream processor as a result of managing the buffering and the queuing system.

23. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Pechanek et al. (US 5,682,491); Athanas et al. (US 5,828,858); Kolanek et al. (US 5,870,436); Lentz (US 5,444,853); North et al. (US 6,055,619); Rupp (5,784,636); Kerstein (US 6,292,483); Alexander et al. (US 6,163,539); Haddock et al. (US 6,295,299); Gove et al. (US 5,526,051); Vincent et al. (US 6,643,285); Mura et al. (US 5,371,860); Reader et al. (US 6,192,073); Brown (US 6,128,307); Cwiakala et al (US 5,257,379).


24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nabil M El-Hady whose telephone number is (703) 308-7990. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 4:00.

Art Unit: 2154

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 21, 2004


Nabil El-Hady, Ph.D, M.B.A.
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2154